



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/519,841	01/12/2005	Frank Dietsche	263524US0PCT	7205
22850	7590	12/10/2009		
OBLON, SPIVAK, MCCLELLAND MAIER & NEUSTADT, L.L.P. 1940 DUKE STREET ALEXANDRIA, VA 22314			EXAMINER KRUER, KEVIN R	
			ART UNIT 1794	PAPER NUMBER
			NOTIFICATION DATE 12/10/2009	DELIVERY MODE ELECTRONIC

**Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.**

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

patentdocket@oblon.com  
oblonpat@oblon.com  
jgardner@oblon.com

<b>Office Action Summary</b>	<b>Application No.</b> 10/519,841	<b>Applicant(s)</b> DIETSCH ET AL.	
	<b>Examiner</b> KEVIN R. KRUER	<b>Art Unit</b> 1794	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

### Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

### Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 16 November 2009.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**.                      2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

### Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1,3-9,16 and 19-26 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) 25 is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1,3-9,16,19-24 and 26 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

### Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

### Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☒ All    b) ☐ Some \*    c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
  2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
  3. ☒ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

### Attachment(s)

- |   |   |
|---|---|
| 1) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)                        | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)                     |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)    | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____  |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____   | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____                                    |

## **DETAILED ACTION**

### ***Continued Examination Under 37 CFR 1.114***

1. A request for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, including the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e), was filed in this application after final rejection. Since this application is eligible for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, and the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e) has been timely paid, the finality of the previous Office action has been withdrawn pursuant to 37 CFR 1.114. Applicant's submission filed on November 16, 2009 has been entered.

### ***Election/Restrictions***

2. Claim 25 is withdrawn from consideration as being directed to a non-elected invention. See 37 CFR 1.142(b) and MPEP § 821.03.

### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112***

3. The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

4. Claims 1, 3-9, 16, 19-24 and 26 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention. It is unclear how layer (C ) may be positioned between said at least one elastic intercoat (D) and layer (C). Said limitation is understood to incorporate the limitations of original claim 2, option

Furthermore, it is not clear if there is a difference between coat © and layer ©. If so, it is not clear how they both can comprise a second substrate.

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

5. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

6. Claims 1, 3-9, 16, 19-24 and 26 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Mack et al (US 6,500,883) in view of (a) Otaki et al (US 6,482,489) and (b) Downey (US 3,880,953) or Korpman (US 4,136,071)

Mack teaches a filled polyamide composition comprising fillers surface modified by treatment with an organosilane and /or organosiloxane coating agent (abstract). Said composition has a impact strength as claimed (see example 5, column 8) and is used to product goods such as electronic devices and parts for motor vehicles (col 6, lines 25+). When used in such embodiments, said layer is attached to another layer (herein understood to read on the substrate of claim 8).

Mack does not teach the claimed multi-coat system. However, Otaki teaches a hologram laminated that reads on the claimed multi-coat system. Said hologram can be applied to high priced goods (Background of the invention) such as those made with the composition of Mack. Specifically, the hologram comprises a 1-50um thick UV curable urethane acrylate hard coat (col 5, lines 25+) and a styrene block elastomer adhesive having a thickness of 4-20um( col 52, lines 53+). Intervening the adhesive and the hardcoat may be a substrate. Said substrate is understood to read on the claimed layers of claim 2. Thus, it would have been obvious to the skilled artisan to apply the

hologram to the substrate taught in Mack in order to provide an authenticating mark on said substrate. With regard to claim 26, the substrate, protective layer, adhesive, or the matrix may comprise polypropylene.

Mack does not teach the adhesive should have the claimed Tg. However, Downey and Korpman each teach pressure sensitive adhesives comprising styrene block copolymers meeting the claimed limitations. Specifically, Downey teaches a block copolymer comprising 10-50wt% styrene (col 1, lines 45+) and Korpman teaches a block comprising 10-35wt% styrene (col 1, lines 35+). Said composition read on the Tg limitation of claim 1 when the diene is isoprene or butadiene and on the limitation of claim 21 when the diene is butadiene. Thus, it would have been obvious to utilize either of the PSAs as the styrene block copolymer PSA taught in Mack because said PSA are taught to exhibit excellent adhesive properties.

7. Claims 1, 3-9, 16, 19-24 and 26 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Onozawa et al (US 6,103,370) in view of (a) JP0518671 (Matsuoka) and (b) Downey (US 3,880,953) or Korpman (US 4,136,071)

Onozawa teaches a hardcoat sheet comprising a base sheet, and a coat layer which is provided on the based sheet and formed form a radiation curable urethane acrylate (abstract and col 2, lines 24+). Said layer has a thickness of 1-10um (col 3, lines 60+). The hardcoat is applied to the base sheet and an adhesive comprising styrene butadiene block copolymers having a thickness of 10-50um (col 4) is utilized to apply the laminate to a window pane (col 3, lines 63+). In use, the window pane is then

attached to another layer (herein understood to read on the substrate of claim 8). The base may comprise polypropylene.

Onozawa does not teach the window pane should comprise a polymer with the claimed impact strength. However, Matsuoka teaches a window pane made of polycarbonate having a impact strength of 60kg/cm/cm or more. The examiner takes the position that said impact strength is taught with sufficient specificity to read on the claimed limitation. Thus, it would have been obvious to the skilled artisan to utilize the window pane taught in Matsuoka as the window pane taught in Onozawa because said window pane has excellent impact resistance.

Onozawa does not teach the adhesive should have the claimed Tg. However, Downey and Korpman each teach pressure sensitive adhesives comprising styrene block copolymers meeting the claimed limitations. Specifically, Downey teaches a block copolymer comprising 10-50wt% styrene (col 1, lines 45+) and Korpman teaches a block comprising 10-35wt% styrene (col 1, lines 35+). Said composition read on the Tg limitation of claim 1 when the diene is isoprene or butadiene and on the limitation of claim 21 when the diene is butadiene. Thus, it would have been obvious to utilize either of the PSAs as the styrene block copolymer PSA taught in Onozawa because said PSA are taught to exhibit excellent adhesive properties.

8. Claims 1, 3-7, 9, 19 and 21-24 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Bergh et al (2003/0104245) in view of Van Havenbergh et al (US 5,334,842).

Bergh teaches a radiation image storage panel comprising a self-support layer, a phosphor particle containing layer a urethane acrylate radiation curable protective layer (abstract). Said layer has a thickness of 1-20um (0042). The binder for the phosphor layer may comprise Kraton, which is herein understood to read on the claimed elastomeric intercoat layer (0041). Said layer has a thickness of 10-1000um (0041). An additional layer may be present between said phosphor layer and urethane acrylate protective layer (0036).

Bergh does not teach that the substrate should comprise a polymer with the claimed impact strength. However, Van Havenbergh teaches the substrate of such panels should have high strength (col 17, lines 35+) and may comprise polyethylenes such as LUMIRROR) metal polyamide, polyimide and the like. Thus, it would have been obvious to utilize polyamide and polyimides, and metals with high impact strength as the substrate taught in Bergh because Van Havenbergh teaches such substrate are desirable in radiation storage panels.

### ***Response to Arguments***

Applicant's arguments filed November 16, 2009 have been fully considered but are not persuasive.

Applicant has incorporated the limitations of claim 2 (b)- an embodiment which was previously rejected- into independent claim 1. Applicant argues the combination fails to teach said embodiment, but the board affirmed the examiner's rejections on 9/16/2009. Since the amended claim reads on a previously rejected embodiment, the

rejections are maintained. Applicant is asked to clarify what issues they believe were not addressed by the Board's decision on 9/16/2009.

For the reasons noted above, the rejections are maintained.

### ***Conclusion***

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to KEVIN R. KRUER whose telephone number is (571)272-1510. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Callie Shosho can be reached on 571-272-1123. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

/Kevin R. Krue/

Patent Examiner-Art Unit 1794